

Resonant Scattering of Muonic Hydrogen Atoms and Dynamics of Muonic Molecular Complex

M. C. Fujiwara^{a,b,*}, A. Adamczak^c, J.M. Bailey^d, G.A. Beer^e, J.L. Beveridge^f,
M.P. Faifman^g, T.M. Huber^h, P. Kammelⁱ, S.K. Kim^j, P.E. Knowles^k,
A.R. Kunselman^l, V.E. Markushin^m, G.M. Marshal^f, G.R. Mason^e,
F. Mulhauser^k, A. Olin^f, C. Petitjean^m, T.A. Porcelliⁿ, J. Woźniak^o,
J. Zmeskal^p

^a *University of British Columbia, Canada*

^b *University of Tokyo, Japan*

^c *Inst. Nucl. Physics Cracow, Poland*

^d *Chester Technology, UK*

^e *University of Victoria, Canada*

^f *TRIUMF, Canada*

^g *Kurchatov Institute, Russia*

^h *Gustavus Adolphus College, USA*

ⁱ *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*

^j *Jeonbuk National University, S. Korea*

^k *Université de Fribourg, Switzerland*

^l *University of Wyoming, USA*

^m *PSI, Switzerland*

ⁿ *University of Northern British Columbia, Canada*

^o *Inst. Phys. Nucl. Tech., Poland*

^p *Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria*

Resonant scattering of muonic hydrogen atoms via back decay of molecular complex, a key process in the understanding of epithermal muonic molecular formation, is analyzed. The limitations of the effective rate approximation are discussed and the importance of the explicit treatment of the back decay is stressed. An expression of the energy distribution for the back-decayed atoms is given.

Keywords: Muonic hydrogen, resonant scattering, epithermal molecular formation

* e-mail: Makoto.Fujiwara@cern.ch

Direct measurements of epithermal resonant molecular formation, recently reported by the TRIUMF Muonic Hydrogen Collaboration [1,2,3], required detailed considerations of processes which were not previously well-studied. Resonant scattering of muonic atoms via back decay of the muonic molecular complex (MMC) is one such process. Despite substantial theoretical efforts in improving the accuracies of muonic hydrogen scattering cross sections, so far little attention has been paid to the back decay process as a scattering mechanism of the muonic atom (except for the spin flip in the $d\mu d$ system). It is the purpose of this paper to emphasize the importance of the resonant scattering and the associated MMC dynamics with the hope of stimulating further theoretical studies.

Resonant formation of MMC, $\mu a^F + DX_{\nu_i K_i} \rightarrow [(d\mu a)_{11}^S xee]_{\nu_f K_f}$ taking place with the rate $\lambda_{\nu_i K_i, \nu_f K_f}^{SF}(E_{\mu a})$, is generally followed by competing processes of either stabilization with the effective rate $\tilde{\lambda}_f$ leading to fusion, or back decay to $\mu a^F + DX_{\nu'_i K'_i}$ with the width $\Gamma_{\nu_f K_f, \nu'_i K'_i}^{SF}$. Here $a = d, t$, $x = p, d, t$, and $X = H, D, T$. F is the hyperfine state of μa , S is the spin of $d\mu a$, and $\nu_i K_i$, $\nu_f K_f$ are the vibrational and rotational quantum number of DX and MMC respectively. Our notations follow those of Ref. [4], but we explicitly account for the possibility of (de)excitation of DX upon back decay $\nu'_i K'_i \neq \nu_i K_i$, *i.e.*, resonant (de)excitation, whose importance will become apparent below.

In the analysis of conventional μCF experiments, an effective renormalized formation rate [4] has been widely used, into which the effect of the back decay is absorbed as:

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{d\mu a}^F = \sum_{\nu_f, K_f, S} W_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF} \sum_{K_i} \omega_{K_i} \lambda_{\nu_i K_i, \nu_f K_f}^{SF}, \quad (1)$$

where $W_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF} = \tilde{\lambda}_f / (\tilde{\lambda}_f + \sum_{\nu'_i K'_i} \Gamma_{\nu_f K_f, \nu'_i K'_i}^{SF})$ is the fusion probability, and ω_{K_i} is the initial K_i population. We observe that even in the case where the transport of muonic atoms can be neglected, at least one of the following criteria must met in order to justify the effective rate approximation of Eq. 1 in describing fusion yields: (a) trivial condition that the back decay probability $(1 - W_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF}) \ll 1$, (b) rapid (compared to MMC formation) re-thermalization of μa in the equilibrium condition, or (c) negligible change in μa energy in *lab* frame before and after the back decay. For example, the condition (a) is satisfied for $d\mu t$ formation at low energies, while the condition (b) applies for $d\mu d$ (at least at high densities), and (c) may be possible in condensed matter if recoil-less processes dominate. If none of the above criteria are satisfied, the μa can be removed from the resonance

regions affecting the kinetics, which was indeed the case in the experiment of Refs. [1,2,3]. In simplified model calculations, where one interaction, either of resonant scattering or potential scattering, is assumed to be sufficient to remove μa from the resonance region, the effective rate approximation overestimates the fusion yield by $(\lambda_{\nu_i K_i, \nu_f K_f}^{SF} + \lambda_{scat}) / (W_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF} \lambda_{\nu_i K_i, \nu_f K_f}^{SF} + \lambda_{scat})$ where λ_{scat} is the potential scattering rate, compared to the explicit inclusion of resonance scattering channel [5]. For $\mu t + D_2$ at resonance peak energy, this factor is as large as ~ 1.5 .

A more realistic estimate of the effect of resonant scattering requires the accurate μa energy distribution after back decay, which depends on the details of the MMC dynamics including: (i) MMC recoil from μa impact upon its formation, (ii) thermalization of MMC center of mass motion in collision with the target medium, (iii) collisional relaxation/excitation of MMC ro-vibrational states ($\nu_f K_f \rightarrow \nu'_f K'_f$), (iv) MMC decay with possible DX excitation, and (v) DX recoil upon MMC decay.

Apart from trivial, but often a neglected effect of the kinematics (i,v), the cross section for $[(d\mu t)dee] + D_2$ elastic collisions has been calculated by Padial *et al.* [6] for relatively low energies; its extrapolation to epithermal energies suggests a value of about $3 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^2$. The corresponding collision rate $\sim 2 \times 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1}$ is an order of magnitude larger than the MMC decay rate 10^{12} s^{-1} , hence substantial thermalization can be expected at high densities.

Calculations of rotational transitions in the MMC were reported by Ostrovskii and Ustimov [7], and by Padial *et al.* [8] for the case of thermal equilibrium targets. Ostrovskii and Ustimov estimate relaxation rates of the order of 10^{13} s^{-1} (a value used in Ref. [4]), while Padial *et al.*, claiming higher accuracy, give $\sim 0.3 \times 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at 300 K (rates are normalized to liquid hydrogen density).

To date, there are no accurate calculations available for vibrational quenching of MMC, except for a rough estimate by Lane [9], who gives 10^7 s^{-1} at room temperature, a rate much slower than other processes. He predicts, however, increasing rates for higher temperature and increasing ν . Future accurate calculations of this process is highly desirable, as the consequence of non-negligible quenching would also have a significant impact on other aspects of molecular formation, such as the fusion rate $\tilde{\lambda}_f$.

Given the initial condition $\nu_i, K_i, E_{\mu a}$, the approximate energy distribution of back decayed μa , $f(E'_{\mu a})$, can be estimated from the following expression [5]:

$$f^F(E'_{\mu a}) = \sum_{\nu'_f K'_f S} h_{\nu_i K_i}^{SF}(\nu'_f K'_f; E_{\mu a}) \sum_{\nu'_i K'_i} g_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF}(\nu'_i, K'_i) \times \int dE_u D(E_u) I \left[E'_{\mu a} - E'_{\nu_i K_i}(\nu_f K_f S; \nu'_i K'_i) - E_u \right], \quad (2)$$

where

$$E'_{\nu_i K_i}(\nu_f K_f S; \nu'_i K'_i) = \frac{M_{DX}}{M_{DX} + M_{\mu a}} \left[\epsilon_{res}(\nu_f K_f) - \Delta E_{\nu_i K_i, \nu'_i K'_i} \right] \quad (3)$$

is the decay Q-value for the specific channel $(\nu_f, K_f, S) \rightarrow (\nu'_i, K'_i, S)$, with $\Delta E_{\nu_i K_i, \nu'_i K'_i} = -[E(\nu'_i K'_i) - E(\nu_i K_i)]$ being the binding energy difference between the initial and final state of DX (*i.e.*, (de)excitation energy of DX due to the resonant scattering). $I[\Delta]$ is the resonance intensity profile for detuning Δ (*e.g.*, $I[\Delta] = \delta(\Delta)$ in the classical Vesman model), while $D(E_u)$ is the Doppler broadening distribution due to the motion of MMC at the time of back decay (*e.g.*, Gaussian distribution with the width $\sigma = \sqrt{4kTM_{\mu a}/M_{MMC}}$ for thermalized MMC if $E'_{\mu a} \gg kT$).

$$g_{\nu_f K_f}^{SF}(\nu'_i, K'_i) = \frac{\Gamma_{\nu_f K_f, \nu'_i K'_i}^{SF}}{\sum_{\nu'_i, K'_i} \Gamma_{\nu_f K_f, \nu'_i K'_i}^{SF}} \quad (4)$$

is the branching ratio for the decay into the state (ν'_i, K'_i, S) , given the MMC state of (ν_f, K_f, S) , and $h_{\nu_i K_i}^{SF}(\nu_f K_f S; E_{\mu a})$ is the ro-vibrational population of MMC at the time of back decay, given the initial condition ν_i, K_i and $E_{\mu a}$. A full evaluation of Eq. 2 would require, in addition to the back decay matrix elements, a solution of kinetics equation involving all the competing processes; some limiting cases were considered in Ref. [5]. We note that in Refs. [10,11], back-decayed μt is suggested to have a thermal energy distribution of the target temperature, but we find this not be the case, even if MMC translational motion and/or ro-vibrational states are completely thermalized (see Eq.3).

In our analysis for Ref. [1], $E'_{\mu t}$ was varied between 1 meV to 0.3 eV in Monte Carlo calculations [12] explicitly taking into account the resonant scattering (an improved version of earlier calculation [13]) to phenomenologically investigate its effect, and some 7% difference in fusion yield was observed, giving a non-negligible contribution to the total systematic uncertainties. Although this error is not overwhelming, a substantial improvement in the accuracy of resonant formation

measurements would require, among others, detailed understanding of resonant scattering processes and MMC dynamics, the first step of which has been illustrated in this report.

References

- [1] M. C. Fujiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1642 (2000).
- [2] T. A. Porcelli *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3763 (2001).
- [3] G. M. Marshall *et al.*, these proceedings.
- [4] M. P. Faifman *et al.*, Muon Cat. Fusion **4**, 1 (1989); Hyperfine Int. **101/102**, 179 (1996).
- [5] M. C. Fujiwara, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of British Columbia (1999).
- [6] N. T. Padial, J. S. Cohen, and M. Leon, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 1172 (1988).
- [7] V. N. Ostrovskii and V. I. Ustimov, Sov. Phys. JETP **52**, 620 (1980).
- [8] N. T. Padial, J. S. Cohen, and R. B. Walker, Phys. Rev. A **37** 329 (1988).
- [9] A. M. Lane, Phys. Lett. B **98**, 337 (1983); *Muon-Catalyzed Fusion and Fusion with Polarized Nuclei*, ed. B. Brunelli *et al.*, (Plenum Press, New York, 1987), pp. 67-72.
- [10] L. N. Somov, Muon Cat. Fusion **3**, 465 (1988).
- [11] Jeitler, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Vienna (1992); Jeitler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 2881 (1995).
- [12] T. M. Huber *et al.*, Hyperfine Int. **118**, 159 (1999).
- [13] V. E. Markushin, Hyperfine Int. **101/102**, 155 (1996).